DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 850 IR 010 214

AUTHOR Tallon, James
TITLE Report on the Use of REFCATSS for Interlibrary Loan Processing.
PUB DATE Dec 80
NOTE 9p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Libraries; Comparative Analysis; *Costs; *Databases; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Information Retrieval; *Interlibrary Loans; *Online Systems; Search Strategies
IDENTIFIERS Canada

ABSTRACT

The database contents, search features, and costs of two services offered by UTLAS (University of Toronto Library Automation Systems) are compared to determine which of the two should be used for interlibrary loan (ILL) processing at Concordia University. A review of studies of CATSS (Catalogue Support System) is provided, as well as a description of the search facilities common to CATSS and REFCATSS (Public Service Support System), and a comparison of the costs of interlibrary loan searching on the two systems. It is recommended that, in virtue of the greater suitability of REFCATSS for ILL use and the dubious cost advantage of CATSS given the anticipated level of use, that REFCATSS be used for ILL searching. Also discussed are arrangements for access to terminals on the three campuses to avoid the high cost of registering an additional terminal for ILL use, and the costs of setting up and training for REFCATSS. Estimates of one-time and ongoing costs are provided, and procedures for implementing the use of the system are outlined. Seven references are listed. (RBF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED217850

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

Report on the use of REFCATSS for Interlibrary Loan Processing

James Tallon
Interlibrary Loans Librarian
December, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Tallon
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR010214

TABLE OF CONTENTS PAGE

I. Introduction.....1

II. REFCATSS and CATSS.....1

III. Communications.....2

IV. Costs.....3

V. Procedures.....4

VI. Recommendations.....5

VII. Bibliography.....6

Appendix I - Sample REFCATSS search

I. Introduction

Libraries have been entering cataloging records into the UTLAS/CATSS database since the early 1970's. In 1979 there were 94 institutions participating in the online network, and client files representing the contributions of close to 500 separate libraries were available for record sharing. A number of libraries have undergone retroconversion projects, including the BC libraries, University of Montreal, McMaster, Mississauga Public, and University of Toronto, allowing access to a substantial and growing number of records for pre 1972 acquisitions.

In addition to the above the CATSS database contains authority records: LC names & subjects, NLC, and user created and shared records; and source files from the Library of Congress (LC MARC), National Library (CAN/MARC), British Library (BNB) and National Library of Medicine (CATLINE). In April 1980 the CATSS database contained 7.2 million records, of which approximately 5.2 million were unique.

This database has obvious potential for ILL verification and location operations. There have been a number of studies on the effectiveness of the CATSS database for ILL searching. A survey by John Hobbins (McGill, 1978) found an 83% success rate for 1973 through 1976 imprints. The National Library reported success rates averaging about 60% for Unicat/Telecat member requests for post 1972 imprints searched between July and December 1979. Probably most relevant to our situation is the ongoing experience at McMaster University of REFCATS for ILL searching; the ILL Librarian at McMaster reports an average success rate of 65% for post 1965 monograph requests.

Searching the CATSS database for ILL locations has the advantage of avoiding the delay currently associated with telexing location requests to the National Library, thus saving, for items found in the database, an average of 4.5 days in the time required to process requests. Because of the size of the database, its inclusion of records of many specialized collections, currency, and access points other than "main entry", it will also be extremely useful for ILL verifications.

UTLAS does not yet have an ILL subsystem (cf. OCLC), however this is in the development plans. There is an electronic mailbox facility which could have some usefulness in certain circumstances and should be investigated further. In general however, problems involved in coordination of its use, cost, and production of the number of copies required in ILL mitigate strongly against its usefulness.

It is likely that in the near future there will be data linkages between UTLAS and American utilities such as OCLC and RLG. Recent announcements of cooperative agreements between RLG and UTLAS and of a large scale study project on data sharing by OCLC and RLG are indicative of a strong trend in this direction.

II. REFCATSS and CATSS

Both REFCATSS and CATSS have the same search facilities. This includes Boolean logic, entry by precise access keys (RSN, LCCN, ISBN/ISSN, CODOC, and precise title) and browsable headings (author, title, series, subject headings and keywords from corporate and conference entries). Records presently indexed for browsable searching include those in the UNICAT/TELECAT, source files,

and recent records of institutions that use the new file architecture (excludes RIBLIN members). Other records are being indexed retrospectively and an expanded keyword facility is in progress. A two step search strategy may be used to obtain all locations for items found through searching the browsable index; the partially indexed records are retrieved using precise access keys determined from the display of a record in the browsable index. Other libraries' records may only be displayed if the searcher's library has a file sharing agreement with that library. At present we have access to other library files through the agreements established by UNICAT/TELECAT.

UTLAS charges a flat rate of $32.30 per hour for REFCATSS use. This was promoted as being equivalent to the average cost of searching CATSS, however it appears in fact to be somewhat higher. The rates are difficult to compare as CATSS use involves an hourly rate ($9.68 minus discounts), search costs (from .0108 to .0538 per entry), logic costs and display charges (e.g. .161 per source bibliographic record). At McMaster it was projected that the cost of using CATSS for ILL would be approximately $20.00 per hour (exclusive of 2nd day searches).

The use of REFCATSS for ILL would have two advantages. Firstly the REFCATSS record display is designed so that record elements required for public service use are clearly identified, requiring no familiarity with catalog formats and codes. Secondly, records indexed for browsable searching have branch location and call number in the REFCATSS record but not in the online "brief" CATSS record. This information will expedite processing of requests by lending libraries, and, in the case of very recent acquisitions, it can be essential as there is usually some delay between the time of a library's cataloging an item and the record's appearance in their public catalog.

Based on the cost differential between CATSS and REFCATSS of $12.30 (above) and estimated use of 17.9 hours (Section IV), using CATSS would result in savings of $220.00 per year. However there is a 10 minute mimimum charge per service on CATSS. Given the yearly volume of searches estimated in Section IV we will be searching an average of 2.5 requests per working day on the SGW Campus, and less than 1 request per day from Loyola. It is not possible to estimate accurately the loss that we may incur because of the minimum charge on CATSS, however, a rough calculation based on the assumption that on the SGW Campus 2.5 requests are sent per day, and at Loyola requests are sent one at a time, and based on the CATSS rate without discounts, indicates that this loss could be as high as $400.00 per year.

It is recommended, therefore, in virtue of the greater suitability of REFCATSS for ILL use, and the dubious cost advantage of CATSS given our anticipated level of use of the system, that REFCATSS be used for ILL searching.

III. Communications

UTLAS services may be accessed either from one of the terminals in Cataloging or from the terminals in the Reference Area at Vanier and Norris. In either case arrangements must be made with Cataloging to schedule ILL use as Concordia can have no more than four users on the system at any given time. The alternative of registering an additional terminal at $538.00 per month minimum is prohibitively expensive for anticipated ILL use.

I have spoken to those concerned in the Cataloging Department and it appears that there should be little difficulty in arranging a schedule of daily searching that will be suitable for Interlibrary Loans. In addition to our scheduled time there are periods during which the system is not used or not used to capacity by Technical Services. These times, before 8:30 a.m., after 5:00 p.m., and perhaps Fridays or break times, could be used if we have too large a number of requests to process during the scheduled time or if the scheduled time is unavailable because the system is down for that period.

There is no communications charge based on use for the data routes to UTLAS from Cataloging, thus use of the Reference terminal would involve an additional $30.60 per hour (long distance rate to Toronto for 1980) expense. Balanced against this is the additional staff time required for transportation to and from the Shuchat Building. For the Loyola Campus use of the cataloging terminals is obviously impractical, and telephoning requests to ILL on the SGW Campus would be time consuming and difficult. On the SGW Campus using the Shuchat terminals would add approximately ½ hour per day staff time (probably more in winter and less in summer), reduce our flexibility in using the system during off hours, and, because of the additional time involved, increase problems with maintaining office coverage during periods when few staff are available.

Based on the estimated use of REFCATSS on the SGW Campus of 14.8 hours (Section IV) it is estimated that using the terminal in Reference would cost an additional $453 per year. Monetary loss in terms of staff time would vary between $900 and $1150 (current salaries, depending upon who is searching).

It is recommended, therefore, that because of the economic and operational advantages involved, REFCATSS be accessed using Reference Department terminals on both the Loyola and SGW Campuses. At some future date it will probably be most efficient to have a terminal within the ILL area.

IV Costs

Set up and training for REFCATSS is $323.00 plus expenses. This includes manuals.

A survey of ILL requests made on the SGW Campus between January and November, 1980 determined that 540 of the 2324 requests received were suitable for REFCATSS searching. This included 482 post 1965 monographs, 39 journals commencing publication since 1965 and sent to the National Library for locations, and 19 post 1965 requests for government documents. Extrapolation to include December produces an estimate of 590 requests per year on the SGW Campus, and based on the 1978-79 ratio of SGW/Loyola borrowing requests 125 additional requests per year would be anticipated from Loyola. Total number of requests per year to be searched on CATSS or REFCATSS is therefore estimated to be 715.

At McMaster University it has been determined that an average search requires 1.5 minutes. We may therefore anticipate requiring a total of 17.9 hours search time on the CATSS database: 14.8 hours on the SGW Campus and 3.1 hours on the Loyola Campus.

Cost estimates for use of REFCATSS in ILL searching are as follows:

One time costs:

Training	$323.00 plus expenses

Ongoing costs (per year)	SGW	Loyola
REFCATSS	478.00	100.00
long distance charges	453.00	95.00
	931.00	195.00
Cost savings		
Telex to NLC (60% x .30 x searches) Staff time.	106.00	23.00
Difference	825.00	172.00

It is anticipated that over the long run some saving of staff time will be achieved due to the relative ease of using REFCATSS compared to manual verification and telexing the National Library. No accurate estimate can, however, be given at this time.

V. Procedures

It is recommended that REFCATSS be used for verification and locations at the Vanier and Norris libraries. REFCATSS should be searched as a first step for requests received by these libraries that are for monographs, Canadian theses, reports, proceedings, or government documents, with imprint dates of 1965 onwards. We anticipate a success rate of 65% or greater for these materials.

Generally these items will be searched by precise title and browsable headings. If the item is not found in this search it should be verified manually and then a second search should be attempted using LCCN, ISBN and/or precise title if different from that stated on the request. If unsuccessful on the second search the request will be sent to the National Library for locations.

The above procedure should also be attempted for articles in journals that began publication in 1965 or later.

Completed REFCATSS searches, positive or negative, should be attached to the request card. After a six month period these searches should be evaluated to determine:

1. Procedures governing first, second, etc. choice of access term and the optimum number of searches in terms of cost and success rates achieved through multiple access points.

2. Whether or not it is preferable to search REFCATSS prior to manual verification. Although prior verification would imply duplication of the verification process for those items found in REFCATSS, it may be that the need for second searches and the time and cost involved in searching primarily in the browsable mode could outweigh this disadvantage.

3. The effectiveness of 2nd searches (with and without title changes)

4. The effectiveness of going to the National Library for locations when locations are not found through REFCATSS

5. Criteria governing choice of items for REFCATSS searching

Following this six month period it should no longer be necessary to attach the results of negative searches to request cards.

REFCATSS should also be used for difficult verifications (those not found in standard sources) irregardless of imprint date of the request. The usefulness of the database in this regard will only become known after considerable experience by those searching such requests; thus an effort should be made initially to search a considerable number and variety of such requests on this database.

Another use of the REFCATSS database will be to obtain call numbers, if not supplied, for recent items for which other libraries have determined Concordia is a location through CATSS or REFCATSS, but for which records have not yet appeared in our card catalog.

No procedural changes are anticipated in the Drummond and SEL libraries (monograph searching is presently done at Vanier and Norris). However, ILL searchers in these areas should be included in training for REFCATSS if they consider that use of this database would aid in the verification processes presently performed there.

VI. Recommendations

1. That REFCATSS be used for ILL searching and locations on the SGW and Loyola campuses.

2. That access be through the Reference terminals on each campus.

3. That initial procedures be as outlined in Section V of this report. After approximately 6 months experience using this system these procedures should be reevaluated so as to maximize our effectiveness and efficiency in this process.

4. That the operating budgets for Interlibrary Loans be increased yearly by $825.00 on the SGW Campus and $175 on the Loyola Campus to cover the cost of the service. An additional $323 (plus expenses) should be budgeted in 1980 to cover training costs.

5. That implementation be early in 1981.

VII. Bibliography

1. UTLAS. Schedule of Charges. April 28, 1980.

2. Freeze, Barbara. Report on the REFCATSS pilot project. 1980.

3. UTLAS. REFCATSS Terminal Operator's Guide (Technical Document #18). March 1980.

4. Velazquez, Harriet. "University of Toronto Library Automation Systems" Online Review, v.3 no.3, 1979.

5. U/T Phase II News from the National Library, July-December, 1979.

6. Hobbins, ATJ. UNICAT/TELECAT. 1978.

7. Council of Ontario Universities. Office of Library Coordination. Use of the UNICAT/TELECAT Union, File by Member Libraries for ILL; Report of the UNICAT/TELECAT Interlibrary Loan Study Group. March 1979.